

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his courtesy in acknowledging the Request for Continued Examination and entering the Amendments filed September 7, 2007 and October 31, 2007.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Caputo et al. (Caputo).

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the card is provided with a patterned treated area where the adhesion is increased in treated areas by a corona, flame or plasma treatment. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to point out the pattern allows for the separation of a card at any area of the business form while maintaining sufficient adhesion to prevent pre-separation of the card. The support for the term "treated area" is found in the specification at page 10, lines 9-12. Support for the use of a corona, flame or plasma treatment is found in the specification at page 13, lines 10-14 and support for the recitation that easy separation may be allowed at any area is found in the specification at page 10, lines 13-20.

The Fischer patent is concerned with a particular form that has a detachable card element held in place with an adhesive which is a part of an adhesive system that transfers the adhesive from the element to which it is applied to the card. In Fischer, the whole surface is treated under the adhesive because the surface of the element to which the adhesive was originally applied was treated according to col. 3, lines 27-31 of Fischer.

When the Fischer device is constructed, the peelable adhesive is transferred to the card as the card is removed. This peelable adhesive will cause the removed card to stick to other cards which is a distinct disadvantage.

The claims of the present application, as amended, point out a process for making a business form with a detachable card where the adhesion of the card to the business form is selectively controlled by forming of a pattern of selective variable adhesion in alternating areas of easy and tight separation by a method comprising a corona, flame or plasma treatment of a surface. In the method defined by amended claim 1 of the present application, the pattern is based on a combination of treated and untreated areas that facilitate the removal of the card without the need to use a peelable adhesive because the adhesive properties of the surface have been modified. The selective adhesion imparted by the pattern, as defined in claim 1, is achieved by creating a surface where certain areas have no treatment and thus no enhanced adhesion as well as other areas which are treated to provide sufficient enhanced adhesion so that the card will not fall off the form prior to when it is desired to remove the card from the surface of the form.

Nothing in the Fischer patent suggests that only a part of the surface of the layer to which the card is to be adhered, must be **completely** treated in order to improve the adhesive properties. This is necessary in the Fischer method because Fisher requires that a peelable adhesive is used which must be removed with the card (col. 5, lines 12-15). Fischer does not teach a method of surface treatment and does not make obvious the corona, flame or plasma treatment methods now recited in amended claim 1.

Caputo has been cited as disclosing a resealable label flap where a selected zone of **a surface** has been "corona treated (differentially treated)". The concept of differential treatment that provides alternating areas of easy and tight separation that extend under a card area defined by a diecut, as recited in claim 1, is not disclosed by Caputo. The present amendment points out that a "**patterned treated area**" is placed on the surface of thin film layer (iv) has selective variable adhesion. Caputo treats a part of the total area of

the surface but this area is **completely treated** and is not treated to form a pattern that extends under a card area or any area that would correspond to the card area of claim 1.

The Caputo patent is directed to the art of resealable label flaps where a pressure sensitive adhesive is placed on the surface of the removable seal so that the removable seal may be *repositioned* on the surface of the container. Caputo applies an unpatterned corona treatment only in the area that is positioned under the label flap for the purpose of increasing the adhesive anchoring characteristics under all of the area contacted by the label flap portion 18 of label flap 14. (col. 2, line 45-55). This area is not formed in a pattern of selective variable adhesion of "alternating easy and tight strength". The Caputo concept is to provide in the corona treated zone, the same level of adhesion, without any pattern, as defined in claim 1 of the present application.

The Caputo patent has no relation to the art of making a card intermediate as it is limited to making resealable bags. This fact points to the inescapable conclusion that one skilled in the art would even consider resealable bags in making a card intermediate.

The text of claim 1 recites that the alternating **areas** of easy and tight separation that extend under the card area defined by the diecut. This recitation points out a concept that is not made obvious by Caputo's use of a zone of undifferentiated or non-patterned corona treatment at the point where the resealable flap is to be positioned.

The Caputo flap element 18 is never intended to be removed during the life of the Caputo bag as that would defeat the reason for enhancing the bond strength of the flap anchor to the surface of the bag.


The Examiner has stated that since Caputo relates to the control of adhesive effects and Fischer teaches that different adhesive effects can be achieved through suitable process control, the references are properly combinable. However, the Caputo patent has been applied for the limited

purpose of its teaching of the corona treatment method of modifying adhesion. The Examiner at page 4, line 3 of the Office Action cited Caputo as teaching a "differential treatment method to obtain the required level of adhesion". The differential method of Caputo is to completely treat the area where the flap is to be anchored as no differential treatment is applied at that location. The language of claim 1 of the present application requires a patterned treated area to be formed that extends under card area defined by the diecut. Thus, Caputo's "differential treatment" is concentrated at one location for the purpose of providing a permanent anchorage for the flap 14. There is not the slightest suggestion that a pattern of *variable adhesion* is to be formed under an area where a card is positioned in order to make the card removable.

For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989